DUPLICATE

USEPA WORK ASSIGNMENT FORM						NT FORM	
1. WORK ASSIGN	MENT INFORM	ATION					
Project Name: _S	auget Area 1 &	2 Contractor: Ecology & F	Environment	Work Assignment	No.: <u>47</u>	-5N60	
Activity:TA_	E	EPA Contract No.: <u>68-W8-0086</u>	Revisi	on No.: <u>02</u>			
Date: August 18,	1 <u>997</u> Contra	actor Control No.:		Modification No. Officer Use Only)	MA		
2. DESCRIPTION O	OF ACTION		-				
New Work Assignment		INTERPORT OF THE PROPERTY OF T	. Add funds Amendment to Final Work Plan Approval . Change in LOE, scope of budget by task .		et evel DW ith nd CO)	[] Work Assignment Completion Notification (No Attachment) Contractor originates Regional determination When signed by CO, this constitutes a stop work order	
3. BUDGET INFOR	MATION		·•		,		
Total Funding received (\$)* Current 170,000 This Action 0 Total 170,000		Interim Budget (IB) Technical (\$)* LOE _20020,000 _(200)(20,000)	Approved Technical LOE		Expenditure Limit (EL)* Technical (\$)* LOE		
* Includes fees		* Includes fees	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ished by WAM/PO		
4. WA COMPLETION DATE Current: February 1998 Revised: 5. EPA COMMENTS: This action approves the August 11, 1997 work plan in its entirety.							
6. APPROVALS							
Contractor Signatures	s: 		EPA Signatures: 8/19/97				
	Site Manager/Firm Date Work Assignment Manager, Leah Evison Phone (312) 886-4696 Phone (312) 886-4696						
Project Officer, Pat Vogutan Approved As Submitted Approved With Changes Not Approved Signature of Contracting Officer, Peggy Hendrixson Date Approved							

USEPA WORK ASSIGNMENT FORM							ENT FORM		
1. WORK ASSIGN	MENT INFORM	ATIO	N						
Project Name: Sauget Area 1 & 2 Contractor: Ecology & Environment Work Assignment No.: 47-5N60							7-5N60		
Activity:TA_	Activity: TA EPA Contract No.: 68-W8-0086 Revision No.: 02								
Date: August 18, 1997 Contractor Control No.: Modification No (Contracting Officer Use Only)									
2. DESCRIPTION	2. DESCRIPTION OF ACTION								
New Work Assignment Interim SOW, schedule, and LOE Complete SOW, estimated budget and schedule	Amendment Change in LOE, Scope by task Add additional tasks of funds		Partial Work Plan Approval X Final Work Plan Approval Approval of work plan Add funds Amendment to Final Work Plan Approval Change in LOE, scope of budget by task Add additional tasks or funds		[] Technical Direction Memorandum . Detailed scope, budget and schedule . Revise expenditure level . Minor shift within SOW (All changes must be with overall scope, budget and LOE approved by EPA CO)		[] Work Assignment Completion Notification (No Attachment) Contractor originates Regional determination When signed by CO, this constitutes a stop work order		
3. BUDGET INFORMATION									
Total Funding received (\$)* Current		1 	Contract Contract		Column C				
6. APPROVALS Contractor Signatures Site Manager/Firm Regional Manager/Fi		Date Date	EPA Signatures: Work Assignment Manager, Leah Evison Phone (312) 886-4696 Project Officer, Pat Vogtman Date						
Approved As Submitted Approved With Changes Not Approved									

TO 6/19/97

3. EPA CO

2. WAM

ce: 1. EPA PO

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION V

DATE: August 18, 1997

SUBJECT: Work Plan Approval for Sauget Area 1 & 2 Pre-NPL Sites, Sauget, Illinois, Technical Assisstance Work

Assignment, Ecology and Environment, ARCS constract 68-W8-0086, Work Assignment

No. 47-5N60.

FROM: Leah Evison

Work Assignment Manager

THRU: Pat Vogtman

Project Officer

TO: Claudea Heise

Contract Specialist

I am in receipt of the subject work plan dated August 1997. I have reviewed the work plan and find that 1) the work plan tasks are within the existing SOW and reflect what was discussed in the kickoff meeting and subsequent meeting between myself and Craig Carlson of E&E, 2) the work described in the work plan is technically appropriate and 3) the costs appear to be fair and reasonable for the LOE planned.

In general terms the contractor proposed 2,061 LOE at a total cost of \$ 166,921, compared to our IGCE totals of 2,398 LOE and \$170,642. A task by task comparison is as follows:

Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE) - Contractor Work Plan Comparison								
Task Description	IGCE LOE Minimum Maximum		Contractor's WP LOE Original Revised		Recommended LOE			
1 - Project Planning & Support	112	220	149		149			
2 - Aquisition of Existing Information	361	749	400		400			
3 - Property Ownership Tables & Maps	338	445	100		100			
4 - Technical Data Summary Tables & Maps	480	692	904		904			
5 - Data Gaps Memoranda	*	*	92		92			
6 - PRP Records Compilation	687	905	316		316			
Total	1,978.00	3,011.00	2,061.00		2,061.00			

^{*} In the IGCE I included Task 5 in Task 4.

Task 1: The contractor's LOE is within the IGCE minimum and maximum range and is recommended

for approval.

- Task 2: The contractor's LOE is within the IGCE minimum and maximum range and is recommended for approval.
- Task 3: Is significantly lower than the IGCE minimum. Further discussions within EPA after the IGCE clarified that we do not need a title search, but only information on current owners. Therefore, I recommend that the contractor's LOE be approved.
- Task 4: The contractor's LOE is significantly higher than the IGCE maximum for this task and significantly lower than the IGCE minimum for Task 6. The IGCE included Task 5 in it's estimate of Task 4 because it is relatively small compared to Task 4. Tasks 4, 5, and 6 all involve a review of existing records for the site, organizing it, and summarizing it. The contractor has proposed to charge more of the hours to Task 4 (technical data) because that work may proceed first. In the IGCE, I charged more of the hours to Task 6 (PRP data). In fact, existing PRP and technical data are inter-mingled in U.S. EPA's and IEPA's files and it is impossible to look through one without also looking through the other. Therefore, it makes little difference which task the hours are charged to as long as the total is within the IGCE estimate. Therefore I recomend Task 4, 5 and 6 for approval.
- Task 5: Recommeded for approval, see above.
- Task 6: Recommeded for approval, see above.

General Issues

I have also reviewed the contractor's proposed travel and other direct costs associated with this work assignment. The number and length of trips proposed in the work plan appear necessary and reasonable for the effort to be performed. Lastly, the professional level distribution of contractor personnel is appropriate for the work planned.